REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were submitted for examination. Claims 1-24 have been rejected. Applicants have amended claims 17 and 22, and added new claims 25 - 30. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-referenced patent application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R §1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings are in compliance with 37 C.F.R §1.83(a). For example, the HomeRF device is illustrated as device B of Figure 1 and as various devices of Figures 2 and 3, as described in the specification. The Bluetooth device is illustrated as device C of Figure 1 and as various devices of Figures 2 and 3, as described in the specification. The contention-free period is illustrated as time frames 103-104 and 113-114 of Figure 1, as described in the specification. The computer system programmed to implement the method of claim 10 is illustrated as device A of Figure 1 and as various devices of Figures 2 and 3, as described in the specification. The set of instructions is illustrated as the flow chart of Figure 4, as described in the specification.

Rejection Under 35 USC §102 Over Bantz et al.

Claims 1-14, 16-17 and 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,123,029 of Bantz et al. ("Bantz").

Applicants respectfully submit that Bantz fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed, including, for example, Applicants' claimed limitation of "operating a first device at a *first hopping frequency* during a first period of time and at a *second hopping frequency* during a second period of time" (emphasis added) as set forth in claim 1.

Bantz does not propose operating a single device at two different hopping frequencies. It is stated in the outstanding office action that Bantz teaches operating a device at a first hopping frequency during interval B1 of Figure 3A and operating the device at a second hopping frequency during interval B2.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Bantz does not teach or suggest operating the device at a second hopping frequency during interval B2. No hopping occurs during interval B2. Bantz merely states, in column 6, lines 38-45, that interval B2 is subdivided into a plurality of *time slots*, not *hops*. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bantz that these time slots represent separate hops, as suggested in the outstanding office action. Moreover, it is specifically stated in column 5, lines 44-47, that interval B is part of a *single* hop, i.e. a single period of constant frequency. (See, e.g., column 3, lines 12-15, for a definition of a "hop" as used in Bantz). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the time slots of interval B2 do not represent separate hops in accordance with a second hopping frequency.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Bantz does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as set forth in independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-9 are dependent. In addition, note that independent claims 10, 16, 17, 22, and 26, upon which all remaining claims are dependent, set forth similarly patentable limitations.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103 Over Bantz

Claims 15, 18-20 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bantz. For the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Bantz does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as set forth in the independent claims, upon which claims 15, 18-20, and 24 are dependent.

Conclusion

The claim amendments presented above were voluntarily made to broaden the scope of the claims.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the objections and the rejections of the claims submitted for examination have been overcome, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/11/02

David J. Kaplan
Attorney of Record for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 41,105
Direct Phone No. (408) 765-1823